A: But let me just say this: it would have been difficult to acknowledge any form of a misleading statement. Is that what you're after?

Q: That is one point of it.

A: Yeah, it would have been. Sure. Sure. 650

When he appeared before the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs on Oct. 30, 1997, Secretary Babbitt swore an oath to tell the truth and then read a brief prepared statement, which said, in pertinent part:

In sum, the allegations that there was improper White House or DNC influence and that I was a conduit for that influence are demonstrably false. There is no connection at either end of the alleged conduit. At one end, as I have stated, I did not speak to Mr. Ickes or anyone else at the White House or the DNC, and at the other end, I did not direct my subordinates to reach any particular decision on this matter, although during my watch, the Department's policy has been not to approve off-reservation Indian gaming establishments over the objections of reluctant communities. The Hudson decision reflected that policy and nothing else.

That should end the matter, and I suppose it would have ended the matter had I not muddied the waters somewhat in my letters to Senator McCain - Senators McCain and Thompson in describing a meeting that I had with Mr. Paul Eckstein on July 14, 1995. 651

* * * *

Mr. Eckstein . . . asked to meet with me. Against my better judgment, I acceded to that requests. [sic] When he persistently pressed for a delay in the decision, I sought to terminate the meeting. I don't recall exactly what was said, but on reflection, I probably said that Mr. Ickes, the Department's point of contact on many Interior matters, wanted the Department or expected the Department to decide the matter promptly. If I said that, it was an awkward effort to terminate an uncomfortable meeting on a personally sympathetic note, but as I have said here today, I had no such communication with Mr. Ickes or anyone else from the White House.

⁶⁵⁰*Id.* at 155.

⁶⁵¹Babbitt Senate Test. at 238.